

Appl. No. 09/911,297

APP 1318

Amdt. Dated August 5, 2005

Reply Final Rejection of June 15, 2005

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has deemed claims 7-12, 14 and 15 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15 have been so amended, claims 11 and 12 remaining dependent on now independent claim 8, and have also been amended to correct inconsistent use of terminology. Allowance of claims 7-12, 14 and 15 are accordingly requested.

Claims 2-6 and 13 stand rejected, 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Chung et al printed patent application 2003/000247 (hereinafter Chung). In response thereto applicants are amending claim 2 from which claims 3-6 directly or indirectly depend, and are canceling claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misread the Chung disclosure, since it is in fact completely distinct from applicants' invention. In accordance with applicants' invention either digital, i.e., voice-over packet, telephone calls or analog telephone calls are connected by their system to customer audio equipment. In complete contrast to this in Chung all communications between the Chung routing systems 214 and 224 are digital through internet 110. The voice tuning module 306 is connected to both the Phone Connection Module 306 and the PC Connection Module 302. The module 306 determines whether the digital packets arriving at the call routing system 214 are destined for an analog telephone or for a computer, that is, to the Phone Connection Module 304 or the PC Connection Module 302. The PC Connection Module is used for connection, not to any audio devices, but to the H.323 terminals (see Para 0036, lines 2-3); in fact PC stands for Personal Computer. Accordingly, applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that the PC Connection Module 302 is a VoP call processor or has any relationship to connection of telephone calls, received as VoP calls, to the customer audio devices. In no way, in Chung, do audio devices receive a digital VoP telephone call from the external packet network via the PC Connection Module; such is definitely not what is described in Chung Para. 0036, as the Examiner has asserted.

Applicants are amending claim 2 more clearly to recite these critical and non-obvious distinctions between their invention and Chung. Thus applicants now recite that their system is for conducting to a customer's audio equipment both analog telephone calls from an external analog telephone network and voice-over-packet (VoP) telephone calls from a digital packet network, the system including an analog interface connecting analog telephone calls from the analog telephone network to an analog call processor, a digital interface connecting the VoP telephone calls from the external packet network to a VoP call processor, and a switching and bridging system which connects one or both of the analog and digital VoP telephone calls to the customer audio devices.

Appl. No. 09/911,297
Amdt. Dated August 5, 2005
Reply Final Rejection of June 15, 2005

APP 1318

Applicants note that, in discussing claim 3, dependent on claim 2, the Examiner acknowledges that Chung is providing communication to the H.323 terminals. Further, applicants submit that claims 3 to 6 are allowable both as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for their own subject matter which is directed to the elements of their invention involved in connecting both analog and digital telephone calls to audio equipment, whether received at the system from an analog telephone network or a digital network.


Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the Chung disclosure accordingly is not an anticipation of their claims since in Chung the distinction is between packet telephone calls being directed to audio equipment (in fact through a PSTN network) and communications being directed to a computer. Other distinctions and advantages of applicants' invention were described, with respect to Chung, in applicants' prior Amendment and won't be repeated here.

Accordingly, applicants request that the Final Rejection be withdrawn, this Amendment entered, and claims 2 through 6, in addition to the claims already deemed allowable, be reconsidered and allowed. It is therefore believed that this application is now in condition to be passed to issue, and such action is also respectfully requested.

If the Examiner deems it would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley Pietrowicz et al

By 
James W. Falk
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 16,154
(732) 669-4465